

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the forgoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-2, 11, 15, and 20 are currently amended.

With these amendments, claims 1-20 are pending for further examination in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al (US 6,879,962) (Smith).

In response of claims 1-14

Amended claim 1 recites in part:

“...**an export file management module** for generating export files, address lists, cargo tracking records by obtaining the basic export data from the system database and the information on cargo tracking and abnormality messages from the tracking module, and for **generating shipping advices based on said export files, address lists, and cargo tracking records**; and

a communication module for receiving the shipping advices, obtaining information on consignees of cargoes by accessing corresponding address lists in the system database, and for **sending the shipping advices to the consignees according to said obtained information on consignees;...**” (Emphasis added)

First, Applicant would like to emphasize that Smith fails to disclose or teach “**an export file**

management module for generating shipping advices based on said export files, address lists, and cargo tracking records” as recited in amended claim 1. Smith only discloses a **monitoring system** 100 for providing updated transport locations/cargo tracking records to client computers 108/assignees, and providing manifests/export files according to updated transport locations/cargo tracking records, so as to be automatically communicating at any geographical position. It is clear that *Smith essentially focuses on “monitoring”* of the transport locations for providing manifests/export files. However, in claim 1, the export file management module not only generates “export files”/“manifests” by obtaining “information on cargo tracking” and “abnormality messages,” but also generates “**shipping advice**” based on the export files and the cargo tracking records for managing exports. Claim 1 *essentially* focuses on “**export managing**” which is different from the “**monitoring**” of Smith.

Second, Applicant would like to emphasize that Smith fails to disclose or teach “**a communication module for sending the shipping advices to the consignees according to said obtained information on consignees**” as recited in amended claim 1. In Smith, the client computers/consignees 108 communicate with the central database 106 to obtain updated geographical position of transport locations, which is **important for monitoring**. Also, the “**shipping advices**” are not sent to the client computers/consignees 108 based on manifests/export files and updated transport locations/cargo tracking records. However, in claim 1, the “**shipping advices**” is generated by the export file management module, and also sent to the consignees by the communication module. The shipping advices are used for “**export managing**” that is patentably distinct from “**monitoring**” of Smith.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Smith.

Claims 2-14 depend from amended claim 1, and should also be allowable since each of them includes the patentably distinguishing features of amended claim 1.

Regarding dependant claim 14, Applicant would like to emphasize that Smith fails to disclose or teach **“a time module for setting a first time parameter, a second time parameter and a third time parameter”** as set forth in claim 14.

Smith only discloses **“one time parameter”** relating to **“transport”** for **“monitoring”** purpose, such as **“automatic communication** at selected intervals with the plurality of **transports** provides transport location intelligence” (column 2, lines 17-19), **“monitor** location at particular time interval, **monitor** whether the location at a particular time interval, **monitor** whether the location goes outside of a defined area” (column 12, lines 34-36), and **“polling** the selected transport at specified intervals” (column 16, lines 9-16). As recited above, “the automatic communication at selected interval,” “monitoring at a particular time.” and “polling at specified intervals” are all related to “transports” for monitoring.

In contrast, claim 14 defines **“three time parameters”** for **“export managing.”** The first time parameter for defines times at which the basic data module **“accesses the manufacturing databases** of the manufacturing workstations ”, the second time parameter defines times at which the export file management module **“accesses the database to generate series of export files;”** and the third time parameter defines times at which “the communication module **sends the reports.”** It is clear the three time parameters set forth in claim 14 are different with each other. With the three time parameters, **“export managing”** is controlled conveniently, which is different from the “monitoring” for **“transport.”**

Therefore, claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over Smith.

In response of claims 15-19

Amended claim 15 recites in part:

“...obtaining the basic export data, the information on cargo tracking and the export files by accessing the system database, and **generating a shipping advice;** and

obtaining information on a corresponding consignee of the cargo by accessing the address

list of the system database, and **sending the shipping advice** to the consignee based on the obtained information.” (Emphasis added)

First, Applicant would like to emphasize that Smith fails to disclose or teach “**generating a shipping advice**” as recited in amended claim 15. Smith discloses “a logistics method...for using a plurality of transports operating to supply a plurality of delivery locations from a plurality of bases by means of logistics computer programming” (column 2, lines 6 –9). It can be understood that the logistics method is focused on “**delivery locations**” of the transports. However, claim 15 is focused on “**export managing**” for generating export files based on basic export data obtained from a manufacturing database, and for automatically sending a shipping advice to a corresponding consignee of a cargo by e-mail. Therefore, when “abnormality messages” from client computers are received, the export file management method as claimed in claim 15 not only includes step of providing “**delivery locations**”, but also “**generating shipping advice**” for export managing. That is, Smith simply fails to disclose step of “**generating a shipping advice**”.

Second, Applicant would like to emphasize that Smith fails to disclose or teach “**sending the shipping advice**” as recited in amended claim 15. Because Smith is focused on “**delivery locations**” of transports or “**monitoring**” transports, so the logistics method includes steps like “automatically communicating at selected intervals with said plurality transports to provide transport location intelligence so as to be operable for automatically communicating at any geographical position for each of the plurality of transports,” “storing said transport location intelligence,” “storing transport information,” and “storing a list of materials,” etc. (see column 23, lines 32-50). However, the method set forth in claim 15 not only includes “storing said received information in the system database” and “generating a shipping advice,” but also “**sending the shipping advice to the consignee.**” That is, Smith simply fails to disclose step of “**sending the shipping advice.**”

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, amended claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over Smith.

Claims 16-19 depend from amended claim 15, and should also be allowable since each of

them includes the patentably distinguishing features of amended claim 15.

In response of claims 20

Amended claim 20 recites in part:

“...**generating a shipping advice** based on the export files, the received information on cargo tracking, and the received abnormality messages;...

sending the shipping advice to a corresponding consignee;

generating a series of reports on a daily basis; and

sending the reports to corresponding recipients.” (Emphasis added)

Applicant would like to emphasize that Smith only discloses a logistics method for a plurality of transports operating to supply a plurality of delivery locations from a plurality of bases using logistics computer programming (column 23, lines 25-27). It can be understood that the logistics method is focused on “**delivery locations**” “**monitoring**” of the transports. However, claim 20 is focused on “**export managing.**” Claim 20 not only includes step of “**generating a shipping advice**” and “**sending the shipping advice**” for export managing that is not disclosed by Smith. Furthermore, the method of managing export files includes steps of “**generating a series of reports** on a daily basis” and “**sending the reports** to corresponding recipients” for “**export managing.**”

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, amended claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over Smith.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Po-Hsuan Wu

By / Frank R. Niranjana / Date: April 2, 2008

Frank R. Niranjana

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649